



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,675	12/17/2001	Isao Ota	111483	5111

25944 7590 07/01/2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

UMEZ ERONINI, LYNETTE T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1765

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/015,675

Applicant(s)

OTA ET AL.

Examiner

Lynette T. Umez-Eronini

Art Unit

1765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 10 and 12-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 10 and 12-18 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/15/2005 has been entered. The finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn to address "a sol having a pH of 1 to 6 or 8 to 13" as recited in (Currently Amended) Claims 1 and 10.

Election/Restrictions

2. Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-3, 10, and 12-18 in the reply filed on 4/15/2005 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 1765

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tastu et al. (US 4,769,073) in view of Aozasa (US 6,171,572 B1).

Tastu teaches an admixture that contains a cerium oxide and lanthanide salt and that has a pH of greater than 6 but not less than 10 (column 7, line 19 - column 8, line 7). The aforementioned reads on and encompasses,

A sol having a pH of 1 to 6 or 8 to 13, **in claim 1.**

Tastu also teaches an admixture with a solution of a cerium salt, an aqueous solution of a salt of at least one trivalent rare earth, which includes lanthanum, praseodymium, and neodymium (column 4, lines 14-29) and lists a composition comprising: ceric oxide, lanthanum oxide, and neodymium oxide and having a mean particle diameter of 1.5 +/- 1 μm , in and EXAMPLE 1 (column 12, lines 13-37). Tatsu discloses ceric oxide in the form of the composition described in French Pat. No. 2,549,846 and such compositions comprise a crystallographic phase of CeO_2 type . . .

Art Unit: 1765

and corresponding to the formula $\text{Ln}_{2-x}\text{Ce}_x\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ in which . . . x is greater than or equal to 0 and less than 2" (column 5, lines 7-15). The aforementioned further reads on,

A sol in which particles are dispersed in a medium, wherein the particles comprise as a main component crystalline cerium oxide of the cubic system and as an additional component a lanthanum compound, neodymium compound or a combination thereof and encompasses wherein the additional component is contained in $X/(\text{Ce} + X)$ molar ratio of 0.005 to 15 in which X is lanthanum atoms, neodymium atoms or a combination thereof, **in claim 1**;

wherein the additional component is a lanthanum compound, **in claim 2**; and

wherein the additional component is a neodymium compound, **in claim 3**;

Tastu differs in failing to teach a particle size of 50 to 150 nm, **in claim 1**.

Aozasa teaches, ". . . a cerium sol having an average colloidal particle size of 3 to 100 nm, and optionally one or more members selected from the group consisting of salts of yttrium, scandium, lanthanum, praseodymium, neodymium, samarium, europium, gadolinium, magnesium, calcium, barium, aluminum, titanium, and hafnium . . ." (column 3, lines 49) and ". . . a cerium sol having an average colloidal particle size of 3 to 100 nm, preferably 5 to 80 nm, more preferably 10 to 50 nm. . . If the average colloidal particle size is smaller than 3 nm, production in industrial scale will be difficult" column 5, lines 52-59).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to modify Tastu's combination of abrasive materials by using Aozasa's sol having a particle size of 3 to 100 nm which falls within the particle size

Art Unit: 1765

range as claimed by applicants for the purpose of ease of production on an industrial scale (Aozasa, column 5, lines 59-60).

6. Claims 10 and 12, 13, and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tatsu (US '073) in view of Aozasa (US '572 B1).

Tatsu teaches an admixture that contains a cerium oxide and lanthanide salt and that has a pH of greater than 6 but not less than 10 (column 7, line 19 - column 8, line 7). The aforementioned reads on and encompasses,

an abrasive containing a sol having a pH of 1 to 6 or 8 to 13, **in claim 10.**

Tatsu also teaches an admixture with a solution of a cerium salt, an aqueous solution of a salt of at least one trivalent rare earth, which includes lanthanum, praseodymium, and neodymium (column 4, lines 14-29) and lists a composition comprising: ceric oxide, lanthanum oxide, and neodymium oxide and having a mean particle diameter of $1.5 \pm 1 \mu\text{m}$, in and EXAMPLE 1 (column 12, lines 13-37). Tatsu discloses ceric oxide in the form of the composition described in French Pat. No. 2,549,846 and such compositions comprise a crystallographic phase of CeO_2 type . . . and corresponding to the formula $\text{Ln}_{2-x}\text{Ce}_x\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ in which . . . x is greater than or equal to 0 and less than 2" (column 5, lines 7-15). The aforementioned reads on,

an abrasive containing sol in which particles are dispersed in an aqueous medium, wherein the particles comprise as a main component crystalline cerium oxide of the cubic system and as an additional component a lanthanum compound, neodymium compound or a combination thereof and encompasses wherein the

Art Unit: 1765

additional component is contained in $X/(Ce + X)$ molar ratio of 0.005 to 0.15 in which X is lanthanum atoms, neodymium atoms or a combination thereof, **in claim 10**;

wherein the additional component is a lanthanum compound, **in claim 12**; and

wherein the additional component is a neodymium compound, **in claim 13**;

which is adjusted with an acidic substance to a pH of 1 to 6, (column ,lines)

Tatsu further teaches, a solution of the cerium salt, the basic solution and the aqueous solution of the salt the trivalent rare earth were characterized, such that the pH of the reaction medium range from 5 to 10 (column 5, lines 53- 66), which reads on, an abrasive, which is adjusted with a basic substance to a pH of 8 to 13, **in claim 15**.

As pertaining to claims 16-18, since Tatsu uses the same composition as claimed by applicants, then using Tatsu's composition in the same manner as in the claimed invention would respectively result in,

an abrasive, which is used for polishing a substrate, which comprises silica as a main component,

an abrasive, which is used for polishing a rock crystal, a quartz glass for photomask, a semiconductor device or a hard disk made of glass; and

an abrasive, which is used in a step of polishing an organic film, a step of polishing Inter Layer Dielectric (ILD) or a step of shallow trench isolation, for polishing a semiconductor device.

Tastu differs in failing to teach a sol in which particles are dispersed in an aqueous medium in a range of 0.1 to 50-wt%, **in claim 10**.

Since Tastu discloses the same combination of sol components, which is known to be well adapted for rapid and efficient polishing of organic glass surfaces (Abstract) and which is claimed by applicants, then it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have been motivated to select any amount in terms of weight percent, including the specific wt% claimed by applicants to accomplish a desired level of rapid and efficient polishing of organic glass surfaces.

Tastu also differs in failing to teach a sol wherein the particles have a particle size of 50 to 150 nm, **in claim 10**.

Aozasa teaches, ". . . a cerium sol having an average colloidal particle size of 3 to 100 nm, and optionally one or more members selected from the group consisting of salts of yttrium, scandium, lanthanum, praseodymium, neodymium, samarium, europium, gadolinium, magnesium, calcium, barium, aluminum, titanium, and hafnium . . ." (column 3, lines 49) and ". . . a cerium sol having an average colloidal particle size of 3 to 100 nm, preferably 5 to 80 nm, more preferably 10 to 50 nm. . . . If the average colloidal particle size is smaller than 3 nm, production in industrial scale will be difficult" column 5, lines 52-59). Aozasa also teaches, cerium sol having a concentration of about 100 to 200 g/liter (~ 10 to 20 g/100 ml or 10-20 wt %), (column 6, lines 4-6).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to modify the combination or abrasive materials as taught by Tastu, by using Aozasa's sol having a particle size of 3 to 100 nm which falls within the

Art Unit: 1765

particle size range as claimed by applicants for the purpose of ease of production on an industrial scale (column 8, lines 42-45).

7. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tastu (US '073) in view of Aozasa (US '572 B1), as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Kasai et al. (US 5,962,343).

Tastu in view of Aozasa differ in failing to teach an abrasive, which is adjusted with an acidic substance to a pH of 1 to 6.

Kasai teaches, "...abrasive solution (sol) can be changed into an acidic abrasive solution (sol) by adding a water-soluble acid in a $[H^+]/[CeO_2]$ molar ratio of 0.001 to 1. This acidic sol has a pH of 1 to 6, preferably 2 to 6. Illustrative examples of the water-soluble acid include inorganic acids such as hydrogen chloride and nitric acid, organic acids such as formic acid, acetic acid, oxalic acid, tartaric acid, citric acid and lactic acid, acidic salts thereof and mixtures thereof" (column 8, line 65 – column 9, line 7).

Since the reference of Kasai illustrates that adjusting an abrasive with an acidic substance is known, then it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to modify Tastu in view of Aozasa by adjusting the pH of an abrasive with an acidic substance solution to a pH of 1 to 6 for the purpose of effecting the claimed composition.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 4/15/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants traverse the 103 rejection of claims 1-3,10, and 12-18 as being unpatentable over Tastu et al. (US 4,769,073) in view of Aozasa (US 6,171,572) for failing to teach a sol that comprises cerium oxide and lanthanum and that has a pH of 1 to 6 or 8-13, along with the rest of the limitations of the independent claims 1 and 10.

Applicants' argument is unpersuasive because Tastu teaches an admixture that contains a cerium oxide and lanthanum and that has a pH of greater than 6 but not less than 10 (column 7, line 19 - column 8, line 7), which reads on and encompasses, a sol having a pH of 1 to 6 or 8 to 13.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lynette T. Umez-Eronini whose telephone number is 571-272-1470. The examiner is normally unavailable on the First Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on 571-272-1465.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 1765

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Itue

June 21, 2005

NADINE G. NORTON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

